

CONTENTS

Hindutva

1-91

1. What is a name? 2. Hindutva is different from Hindulism. 3. What is Hindu? 4. Many other till, 5. Hindu as a nation, 6. Other names. 7. How names are given. 8. International Life. 9. Fall of Buddhism. 10. Buddhism a universal religion. 11. Then came Hindutva. 12. Hindutva in favour of Nationality. 13. Hindutva of States. 14. Back to the Vedas. 15. Hindutva. 16. What is a name? 17. Hindu and Hindutva. 18. Hindutva to Hindulism. 19. Hindu: all one and a nation. 20. Hindutva as a religion. 21. Foreign Hindutva. 22. Hindutva as a work. 23. Hindutva as a religion. 24. Hindutva as a religion. 25. Hindutva as a religion. 26. Hindutva as a religion. 27. Hindutva as a religion. 28. Hindutva as a religion. 29. Hindutva as a religion. 30. Hindutva as a religion. 31. Hindutva as a religion.

Essentials of Hindutva

What is a name?

We hope that the fair Maid of Vroom who made the imprisoned appeal to her lover to change. A name that was not hand, nor foot, nor arm, nor leg, nor any other part belonging to a man would forgive us for this our little tribute. Hindutva is a name. We make bold to assert that, 'Hindutva' is a name and love to remain so. We too would, had we been in the position of that good friend, have advised her youthful lover to yield to the pleading power of the logic which so fondly urged 'What's in a name? That which we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name.' For, things do matter more than their names, especially when you have to choose not only of the two, or when the association between them is either new or simple. The very fact that a thing is indicated by a dozen names is a dozen human tongues distrust the supposition that there is an invariable connection or natural concomitance between sound and the meaning it conveys. Yet, as the magic of the word with the thing it signifies grows stronger and lasts long, so does the channel which connects the two states of consciousness tend to allow an easy flow of thought from one to another. All at last it seems almost impossible to separate them. And when in addition, by this a number of secondary thoughts or feelings that are generally raised by things get mystically entwined with the word that signifies it, the name seems to matter as much as the thing itself. Would the fair Apostle of the tree that so mysteriously questioned 'What's in a name?' have liked himself to nickname the God of her deity as 'Paris' instead of 'Romeo'? Or would he have been ready to wear by the name that tipped with silver all the four legs of his, that it would have been sweet and musical to his heart to call his 'Juliet' by 'any other name' such as 'Rosaline' or 'Rosaline'? Nay more; there are words which imply an idea in itself extremely complex or an idea of a vast and

2

HINDUTVA

abstract generalisation which seem to take, as it were, a being into themselves or live and grow in an organism would do. Such names though they be 'word based, not fact, nor any other part belonging to a man' are not all that, precisely because they are the very soul of man. They become the idea itself and live longer than generations of men do. Jesus died but Christ has survived the 'Roman' Emperor and the Empire. Inscribed at the foot of one of those beautiful paintings of 'Madonna' the name of 'Fatima' and a Sycamore would keep going at it as eternally as at any other piece of art; but just restore the name of 'Madonna' itself, and behold the Madonna would lose their richness and beauty, his eyes their inexpressiveness and turn towards in adoring recognition, and his whole being get infused with a consciousness of the presence of Divine Motherhood and Love! What is a name? Ah! Isoli Ayodhya - Hindutva, or nickname her Hindutva Prince - a Pushal, or add the American to always Washington into a Hindutva, or provide a Hindutva to our Hindutva a Jew, and you would soon find that the open source 'you are' the only word of the type!

Hindutva is different from Hindulism

To this category of names which have been to amplified little sorrow of life and inspiration belongs the word Hindutva, the essential nature, and significance of which we mean to investigate into. The ideas and ideas, the systems and systems, the thoughts and sentiments which have centred round this name are so varied and rich, so powerful and so subtle, so strong and yet so mild, that the term Hindutva defies all attempts at analysis. Early centuries, if not more, had been at work to mould it into its present shape. Prophets and poets, lawgivers and philosophers, and Hindutva, have thought, felt, fought and died just to have it settled that! For hindutva is not the result of casual accidents - only conflicting, now co-existing, now co-operating - of our whole race? Hindutva is not a word but a history. Not only the spiritual or religious history of our people as an empire is taken to be by being confounded with the other extreme term Hindulism, but a history in full Hindutva is only a derivative, a fraction, a part of Hindutva. Unless it is made clear what is meant by the latter the first remains unintelligible and vague.

ESSENTIALS OF HINDUTVA

2

Failure to distinguish between these two terms has given rise to much self-deceiving and mutual suspicion between some of those sincere communities that have followed this inalienable and constant banner of our Hindu civilisation. What is the fundamental difference in the meaning of these two words would be clear as our argument proceeds. Here it is enough to point out that Hindutva is not identical with what is vaguely indicated by the term Hindulism. By an 'ism' is generally meant a theory or a code more or less based on spiritual or religious dogma or system. But when we attempt to investigate upon the essential significance of Hindutva we do not primarily—and certainly not mainly—concern ourselves with any particular theological or religious dogma or creed. Had not language misused in our way then 'Hindulism' would have certainly been a better word than Hindutva as a name parallel to Hindutva. Hindutva embraces all the departments of thought and activity of the whole being of our Hindu race. Therefore, to understand the significance of this term Hindutva, we must first understand the essential meaning of the word Hindu itself and realize how it came to embrace such imperial sway over the hearts of millions over millions of mankind and won a loving allegiance from the bravest and best of them. But before we can do that, it is imperative to point out that we are by no means attempting a definition or even a description of the word limited, less satisfactory and essentially academic term Hindulism. How far we can succeed or are justified in doing that would appear as we proceed.

What is Hindu?

Although it would be hazardous at the present stage of official research to state definitely the period when the foremost band of the intrepid Aryans made their home and lighted their first sacrificial fires on the banks of the Sindhu, the Indus, yet certain it is that long before the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians had built their magnificent civilisations, the holy waters of the Indus were daily witnessing the fire and curling columns of the sacred sacrificial smoke and the valleys surrounding the banks of the Indus were the spiritual fervor that animated them. The adventures which propelled their intrepid explorers, the routine to which their thoughts rose—all these

great mission which the Shishus had undertaken of founding a nation and a society, found and reached its geographical limit when the Valorous Prince of Ayodhya made triumphant entry in Ceylon and actually brought the whole land from the Himalayas to the Sea under one overlordship. The day when the Prince of Victory returned to Ayodhya, undaunted and unchallenged, the great white Umbrella of Sovereignty was unfurled over that Imperial throne of Ramachandra the brave, Ramachandra the good, and a loving allegiance to him was sworn, not only by the Princes of Aryan blood but Raksasas—Sagras—Babhisras from the south—that day was the real birth-day of our Hindu people. It was truly our colossal day; for Aryan and Aryanee, finding themselves into a people were born of a nation. It succeeded up and politically crowned the efforts of all the generations that preceded it and it handed down a new and common mission, a common banner, a common cause which all the generations after it had consciously or unconsciously fought and died to defend.

Other names

A synthetic conception gains its strength if it finds a term comprehensive enough to give it an eloquent expression. Those terms *aryavart* or *aryavarta* were not so suitable to express the vast regions that embraced the whole continent from the Indus to the sea and aimed to weld it into a nation. *aryavart* as defined by the ancient writers was the land that lay between the Himalayas and the Vindhya. 'अर्यवर्तं वन्द्यवर्तं प्रपञ्चवर्तम्' it did although it was too small to the circumstances which gave it birth, yet and therefore, it could not serve as a common name to a people that had welded Aryan and non-Aryan into a common race and had earned their culture—empire—far beyond the bounding mountains of Vindhya. This necessity of finding a suitable term to express the expansive thought of an Indian Nation was more or less effectively met when the name of *Bharat* came to exercise its sway over the entire world. Without entering into speculations as to who the Bharat was—the Vedic Bharat or the Jain one—or what was the exact period at which he ruled, it is safe enough for us to know that his name had been not only the accepted but the cherished epithet by which the people of *aryavart*

and *aryavart* delighted to call their common motherland and their common national empire. Thus as the horizon opened out to the South we find that the centre of gravity had very noticeably shifted from the Sarasvati to the Ganga-Jamuna Delta and the common *aryavart* or *aryavarta* of *aryavart* gave way to the politically grander expression *Bharat* which included in its sweep all that lay between the Himalayas and the Sea. This is most clearly indicated by the definition of our Nation suggested at a period when the vast conception must have been dwelling over the minds of our great sages. We have met with a better attempt to define our position as a people than the Sanskrit couplet in the *Hitopadesha*, 'सर्व नरपुंसक विमोक्षयेत् भारतम् । सर्व नृपराज सर्व नरपते नरपति न'.

How nation was given

But this new word *Bharat* could not altogether suppress our cradle name *aryavart* or *aryavarta* nor could it make us forget the line we trace to that River of rivers—the *Sarasvati* at whose breast the *aryavarta* and people had drunk the milk of life. Our frontier provinces which bordered the course of *Sarasvati* still clung to their ancient name *aryavart*. And throughout the Sanskrit literature we find *aryavart* recognised as an integral and an important part of our body politic. In the great *Mahabharata* we find the King of *aryavart* *Arjuna* prominently and is said to have been closely related to the Bharat. Although the limits of the *aryavart* shifted from time to time, yet the language that the people speak—did then and does even now mark them out as a people by themselves—from *Melina* to the sea, and the name 'Bharat' which it bears is an emphatic reminder that all those who speak it are *aryavarta* and are entitled to be recognised as a geographical and political unit in the commonwealth of the Indian people. Although the epithet *aryavart* succeeded in almost overhauling the title name of our nation in India, yet the foreign nations were to have noted this for it and all our frontier provinces continued to be known by their ancient name, so even our immediate neighbours—the *Aravali* *Portugals*, the *Jews*, the *Greeks* and others clung to our ancient name *aryavart* or *Indus*. They did not merely designate the homeland of India by this term as *India* (not by, but the whole nation into which the ancient *aryavart* by

expansion and assimilation had grown. The *Aravali* *Portugals* know us as *Indus*, the *Greeks* designate the land as *India* and through the *Greeks* almost all Europe and later on America as *India* or *Indus*. Even *Hu-chi-tung* who lived so long with us permits in calling us *aryavart* or *Indus*. Having a few examples as that of *Alphonsus* being called as *aryavart* by the *Portugals*, very rarely indeed, had the foreigners forgotten our cradle name or preferred the new one *aryavart* to it. Down to this day the whole world knows us as 'Hindu' and our land as 'Hindustan' as if in fullness to the wishes of our Vedic sages who were fond to salute this choice.

But a name by its nature is determined not so much by what we like to call ourselves but generally by what others like to do. In fact a name is called into existence for the very purpose. Self is known to itself immutably and without a name or even without a form. But when it comes in contact or conflict with a 'non-self' then where it stands in need of a name if it would communicate with others or if others wish to play it. If the world treats that a teacher or a wit must be handed down as an 'arjuna' or a 'guru arjuna' and then he, in spite of his liking, is very likely to be remembered as such. If the same chosen by the world for to be directly against our liking then it is yet more likely to shadow all other names. We might have chosen 'aryavart', 'aryavarta', 'aryavarta'. But if the world has upon the word by which they would know us as one recollect of our glory or our duty love then that word is certain to out only to shadow but to survive every other name we may have. This fact added to the circumstances which brought us first into close contact and then into a fierce conflict with the world at large, soon enabled the epithet *Hindu* to meet itself once more and so push into the background even the well beloved name of *aryavart* itself.

International life

Although *Hindus* were by no means cut off from the outside world before the rise of *Buddhism* and although their world politics had already assumed such dimensions as to give a just occasion to our patriotic poet *Tagore* to claim

'एतन्मन्त्रं सर्वभूतानां त्रयम् ।
सर्वं भूतं हिन्दुं सर्वं भूतम्' ॥ (१५)

yet as far as the present argument is concerned, the international life of India, after the rise of *Buddhism*, requires chiefly to be considered. Because it was about this time when political enterprise having exposed or exhausted all possibilities of expansion in our own land naturally began to overflow its limits to an extent unprecedented before and the communications with the outside began to knock at our doors more impressively and soon impressively than they ever had done. In addition to these political developments the great and divine mission that set in motion 'the wheel of the law of Righteousness' made India the very heart—the very soul—of almost all the then known world. To countless millions of human souls from *Misra* to *Mexico*, the land of the *Indus* came to be the land of their Gods and God-men. Thousands of pilgrims from distant shores poured into this country and thousands of scholars, preachers, sages and saints came from this land to all the then known world. But as the outside world pertained to recognising us by our ancient name 'Sindhu' or 'Hindu' both these incoming and outgoing processes helped mightily to render that epithet to be the most prominent of our national names. The necessity of political and diplomatic correspondence with various states, who knew us as *Hindus* or *Indus*, must also have, by making it incumbent on our people to respond to it, revived the use of this epithet thus also by side with and then at times even instead of the name *Bharat* itself.

But if the rise of *Buddhism* has thus enabled this epithet to grow in prominence throughout the world and made us more and more conscious of ourselves as *Hindus*, then strange to say the fall of *Buddhism* only carried this process further than ever.

Fall of Buddhism

We fear that the one telling factor that contributed to the fall of *Buddhism* more than any other has escaped the domineering attention of scholars which it deserves. But as the subject is bandied but rarely involve its treatment here we cannot treat it here in full. All that we can do here is to make a few general

standards and have them to be reproduced and detailed out to a more favourable occasion if the work be not done by others better fitted to do it. Can it be that philosophical differences alone could have made our nation turn against Buddhism? Not wholly: for, these differences had been there all along and even furnished aids by side with each other. Can it be the general limitation and demeritisation of the Buddhist church itself? Not wholly: for, if some of the Viharas destroyed a loom, lay and promiscuous crowd of men and women who lived on others and spent what was not theirs on disposable pursuits of life yet, on the other hand the life of those spiritual giants of Ashoka and Mahindra had not altogether ended: not had such scenes been peculiar to the Buddhist Viharas alone! All these and many other shortcomings would not have attracted such keen attention and proved fatal to Buddhism: power in India had not the political consequences of the Buddhist expansion been so disastrous to the national vitality and even the national existence of our race. No, perhaps to a vast impediment could be more dramatic in its effect in forestalling the reforming catastrophe than that incident in the life of the Shakyas, when the news of the gate of the Hindu tribal republic of the Shakyas was carried to their former Prince when he was just laying the foundation stone of the Buddhist Church. He had already enrolled the flower of his clan in the Buddhist sangha and the Hindu Shakyas Republic thus deprived of its bravest and best, fell an easy victim to the wrong and sorrow in the last, very life time of the Shakyas. The news when carried to him is said to have left the Enlightened unconscious. Countless rolled on; the Prince of the Shakyas had grown into the Prince of Princes—the Lord—the great conqueror of worlds. The nations of his Hindu Shakyas State expanded and surpassed the confines of India; and as if to give a touch of political precision and political justice, the world felt that had occurred the tribal republic of Kapilavastu befall the whole of Bharatavarsha itself and it felt as easy prey to the strong and warlike—not the Shakyas of their own kind and kin but—the Kshatriyas and the Vedic Dharma! Of course the Enlightened would perhaps remain as unaffected as ever, even if this news could ever reach him like the first. But the rest of Hindus then could not deal with equanimity this act of bitterness and political servitude at

the hands of those whose Buddhism violence could all be justified by the steady smoothed formulas of virtue and spiritual brotherhood, and whose steel could all be blunted by the soft palm leaves and chanted charms. We do not mean to understate—much less accuse—the virtues of the great brotherhood and its Devan Mission. We have only to point out the circumstance that it was glaring to escape the attention of any student of History. We know that it could easily be ground against this statement that the greatest and even the most powerful Indian Kings and Emperors known belong to the Buddhist period. Yet, but known as whom?—to Europeans and those of us who have unconsciously inhibited not only their thoughts but even their perceptions. There was a time when every school history in India opened from the Muhammadan invasion because the average English writers of that time knew very little of our earlier life. Lastly the general knowledge of Europe has extended backwards to the rise of Buddhism and we too are apt to look upon it as the first and even the most glorious epoch of our history. The fact is, it is neither. We yield to none in our love and admiration and respect for the Buddha—the Dharmas—the Sangha. They are all ours. Their glories are ours and ours their failures. Great was Ashoka, the Devanagiri, and greater were the achievements of Buddhist Bhikkhus. But achievements as great if not greater and things as truly and quite positive and simultaneously had gone before them and had created them to be what they were. So, we do not think that the political stability of the many nobility of our race began and ended with the Mauryas alone—was a consequence of their embracing Buddhism. Buddhism had conquests to claim, but they belong to a world far removed from this narrow circle of our world—where feet of clay do not stand long, and steel could be easily sharpened, and steel—steel is too powerful and real as to be quenched by painted streams that flow perpetually in heaven. These must have been the considerations that must have driven themselves home to the hearts of our patriots and thinkers when the Hindu and Shakyas poured the volcanic torrents and burst all that thrust. The Indian race had the spiritual ideas of their race—their thrones and their families and the very Gods they worshipped—trampled under foot, the holy land of their love devastated and ruled by hordes of barbarians, so that the

there in language, religion, philosophy, society and all the soft and human attributes of man and God—was superior to them in strength alone!—strength that remained up its sword. In two words—Fire and Steel! The statement was clear. Clear also was the fact that Buddhism logic had no argument that could efficiently meet this new and terrible dualism—this fire, this strange triple of Fire and Steel. So the leaders of thought and action of our race had to rethink their Spiritual Fire to oppose the Barbarians—Dharma—to reopen the gates of Vedic India for itself to get it sharpened on the steel of the 'Terrible'—so that the 'Spirit of the Times' be appeased. Now were their anticipations fulfilled. The success of the reformed Hindu army was undisputed and indisputable. Vikramaditya who drove the foreigners from the Indian soil and Lakhaditya who caught and chastised them in their very dens from Turkey to Mongolia—were the complements of each other. Vikram had accomplished what formula had failed to do. Once more the people rose to the heights of greatness that shed its lustre on all departments of life. Poetry and philosophy, art and handicraft, agriculture and commerce, thought and action felt the quickening impulse which consciousness of independence and strength and victory alone can make. The nation as usual was complete even to a fault. 'Up, said the Vedic Dharma!—back to the Vedas! The national cry grew louder and louder, more and more imperative, because this was especially a political necessity.

Buddhism—a national religion

Buddhism had made her and yet the greatest attempt to propagate a universal religion. 'Go ye Buddhism to all the four directions of the world and preach the law of Righteousness!' Truly, it was a law of Righteousness—it had no ulterior end in view, no lust for land or lust for quickening its steps; and guided through its achievements were it could not eradicate the seeds of national passion out of political ambitions and of individual aggressiveness in the minds of all men so such an extent as to make it safe for India to change her sword for a Rotary. Even then, to get an example, did India declare her will to 'take more pleasure in the conquest of peace and righteousness than in the conquest of arms.' Nobly she tried: all it so nobly it to make

herself righteous in the eyes of Lux and Lust: had she not bowed Royal edicts to the effect that the very word 'be executed before it was poured out for horses and elephants to drink, so as to entice the day lives in the waters to escape immediate death? And had she not opened committing centres in the midst of the sea that felt in her coasts of the world, nor had the very folk seemed to find on such other? Nobly did she try in vain killing by getting killed—and it had found me the poor leaves as times set too fragile for steel! As long as the whole world was red in tooth and claw and the national and racial distinction as strong as to make steel brutal, so long if India had to live at all a life whether spiritual or political according to the right of her soul, she must not lose the strongly born of national and racial cohesion. So the leaders of thought and action grew sick of repeating the motto and words of Universal Brotherhood and bitterly complained:

‘ने नरा देव विष्णु मरुतादेव विष्णुः ।
दे माता भिक्षुदेव तुल्यः शत्रुते ॥
आचार्यनं दे विष्णुः सति नारायणः ।
इति नृपुत्रव्यासः सत्यः । दे नृपुत्रः ॥
अनार्यनं न शत्रुते विष्णुः शत्रुते ॥
आचार्यनं विष्णुः शत्रुते नारायणः ॥ (तुल्यः)

and when the barbarian hordes of the Shakas and the Huns—who had ravaged their fair land that had in their confidence and herself in a Buddhist's dress, chased her sword for Rotary and had taken to the ways of virtue and nonviolence—were expelled beyond the Indus and further, and a strong national Shaka was firmly established, then it was the national that the leaders of our race should have realised what an immense amount of strength could be derived if but the new national State was backed up by a Church as intensely national.

Moreover everything that is common to us with our spiritual virtues our power of upholding them. The fact that has nothing in common with us in the fact that to be most fully realised by us just as a friend that has almost everything in him which we admire and prize in ourselves is likely to be the friend we love

most. The necessity of creating a better grade of wage and improving a power of studying engineers especially in India that had under the system of Universalism and non-violence lost the faculty even of resisting its own crime and aggression, could best be accomplished by cutting off even the semblance of a common worship—a common Church, which required him to sleep the head of those who had been the very hand that had strangled him as a nation. What was the use of a universal faith that instead of strengthening the fanaticisms and hatreds of other nations only excited their lust by having India offenders and murderers? No, the only safe-guard in future was violence and strength that could only be born of a national self-consciousness. She had poured her life's blood for spirituality that tried to prove otherwise.

Then came reaction!

The reaction against the universal tendencies of Buddhism only grew more intense and powerful as the attempt to re-establish the Buddhist power in India began to assume a more threatening attitude. Nationalist tendencies refused to bicker with our national independence and scope. A foreign conqueror as our overlord. But if that foreign invader happened to be discovered inclined towards Buddhism, then he was sure to find some warm sympathiser in the Indian Buddhists all over India who as Catholics have always had some important reason in England to sympathise with their efforts to restore a Catholic dynasty in England. Not only this but dark hints abounded in our ancient records to show that at times some foreign Buddhist power had actually invaded India with an express national and religious aim in view. We cannot treat the history of this period exclusively but we can only point to the half symbolic and half actual description given in our old Puranas of the war waged on the highway by the Yama (the King of the Hell) and his Buddhist allies. The record tells us in a mythological strain how a big battle was fought on the banks of the river 'Sita', how the Buddhist forces made China the base of operation (चक्रवर्तिनः प्रविष्टवन्तः), how they were rebuffed by fightingmen from many Buddhist nations:

बौद्धदेशीयानां महासत्तां शतवारं धारयत् ।
रत्नाकराच्छिखरेषु युद्धाय सन्निविष्टः ॥

and how after a tough fight the Buddhists lost it and paid heavily for their defeat. They had formally to renounce all other national aims against India and give a pledge that they would never again enter India with any political end in view. The Buddhist as individuals had nothing to fear from India—the land of liberation—but they should give up all dreams of endangering the national life of India and her independence:

‘सर्वेषां जीवन्मुक्तये सर्वे वयं ब्रह्म ।
सर्वेषां न शिरसाः कर्माणां दुर्धरे ॥’ (गणितपुराण, अष्टादशस्कंधः)

Institutions in favour of Nationality

And thus we find that institutions that were the powerful nuclei of our nation were reared—बौद्धव्यवस्था which could not be wiped away even under the Buddhist rule, grew in popularity to such an extent that kings and emperors felt it a distinction to be called ‘बौद्धव्यवस्थापकः’ (बौद्धाय राज्ञि) —‘बौद्धव्यवस्थापकः, सम्राट्’ (बौद्धाय सम्राट्). Reaction to foreign of this institution grew so strong that our nationality was almost getting identified with it. Without the distinction that drew a line of demarcation between us and foreigners:

‘पाण्डुराचार्यस्य सौमदेयं न विदुः ।
न शक्यतेनैव साधुव्यवस्थितं ननु ॥’

Thus this was but a natural step to prohibit our people from, those shares which were monopolised—in some cases thereby benefitting—on such peculiar institutions as these and where our people could not be expected to receive the protection that would enable us to keep up the spirit and letter of our faith. Reaction to the reaction was, perfectly intelligible when viewed in politically: for we had frequently met with patriotic thinkers even among our heretics who would stand for laws prohibiting our men from emigrating to nations where they are sure to be subjected to national disabilities and discriminations?

Comingling of Races

Thus it was political and national necessity that was at once the cause and the effect of the decline of Buddhism in India. Buddhism had its geographical centre of gravity bent. So it was no imperiousness in nature at least the national centre of gravity that India had lost in attempting to get identified with Buddhism. When the nation grew intensely self-conscious or self-organised would do and was in direct conflict with the non-self it instinctively turned to draw the line of division and mark with the position it occupied as to make it clear to themselves where they exactly stood and so the world how they were unmistakably a people by themselves—not only a racial and a national, but even a geographical and political unit. On the southern side of our country the natural and strategic limits were already reached, established and sanctified. The frontiers of the deep and boundless sea in which our southern peninsula set in almost parallel to its gate and position. The ‘वज्रयज्ञ’ had placed the eyes of generations of our poets and patriots. But on the north-western side of our nation the comingling of races was growing rather too conspicuous to be lightly and our frontiers too shifty to be safe. Therefore it would have been a matter of surprise if the intense spirit of self-assertion that had found no bolder an asylum under the patronage of the aspects of Ujjain had not made our patriots turn to this pressing necessity of drawing a frontier line for as that would be as valid as effective. And what could this line be but the majestic yet powerful river—the River of rivers—the ‘Sita’? The day on which the frontiers of our race had proved that stream they ceased to belong to the people they had definitely left behind and laid the foundation of a new nation—were reborn into a new people that, under the guiding star of new hope and new mission, were destined by assimilation and by eagerness to grow into a race and a new polity that could only be most fittingly and fittingly derived as Sita or Sita.

Back to the Vedas

Not was this attempt to identify our frontier line with the river Sita as a suggestion. In fact it was but the natural consequence of the great, age-old of the national revival. Back to

the Vedas! The Vedic Shure based on and backed up by the Vedic Church were designated by the Vedic name, and—so far as it was then possible—identified with the Vedic line. And this process of events which the very general trend of history should have enabled us to anticipate seems to have actually gone through. For one of patriotic Sita's purposes so that patriotism, the grandson of the great Sita's, after having defeated the second attempt of foreigners to rule in and expelled them beyond the Indus, issued a Royal Decree to the effect that thereafter the Indus should constitute the line of demarcation between India and other non-Indian nations.

‘एतन्निष्पन्नं ननु सविधान्यवृत्तिः ।
विश्वामित्रे नमः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥
विश्वामित्रे नमः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥
सविधान्यवृत्तिः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥
विश्वामित्रे नमः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥
विश्वामित्रे नमः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥
विश्वामित्रे नमः सविधान्यवृत्तिः ॥

(गणितपुराण, अष्टादशस्कंधः)

Shikharas

The vast extent of the names of our country of which we have a record is surprising of itself. Even Sita's is not most accurately be a better designation besides being personal in its appeal. The glories of a person however magnificent, lose their glamour as time passes on. The name that transcends itself by appealing to such personal glories and achievements, can never be an effective and permanent source of ever rising consciousness of gratitude and pride as a name that, besides being reminiscent of such national achievements and beloved personal worth, is in addition to it associated with some great beneficent and potential natural phenomena. The Emperor Harish is gone and goes along with the emperor as great I—but the Sita goes on far and wide; for ever inspiring and fertilising our sense of gratitude, winning our sense of pride, increasing the Sita's reputation of our race—

in national feeling march over the destinies of our people. It is the vital spirit and that connects the remotest part to the remotest part. The same old emotion and identity our nation with a river like that, million nature on our side and hence our national life on a foundation, that is, so far as human calculation is concerned, as lasting as eternity. All these considerations must have fired the imagination of the great leaders of thought and action and made them realise the ancient Vedic name of our land and nation *Pragya*—the 'pragya' which is 'pragya'.

The epithet *Pragya* besides being Vedic had also a certain advantage which could only be called lucky and yet is too substantial to be ignored. The word *Pragya* is *Pragya* does not only mean the India but also the Sea—'pragya' which gives southern India to that the sea and the point out almost all the frontiers of our land at a single stroke. Even if we do not accept the tradition that the *river Pragya* is only a branch of the *river* which falls into flowing streams on the eastern and western slopes of the Himalayas and then constitutes both as eastern as well as western frontiers, still it is indubitably true that it circumscribes our northern and western boundaries in its sweep and so the epithet *Pragya* calls up the image of our whole Motherland : the land that lies between *Pragya* and *Pragya*—from the Indian to the Sea.

What is said ?

But it must not be supposed that the epithet *Pragya* condescended itself to our parents only because it was geographically best fitted. For, we find it emphatically stated that the concept, expressed by this word was national and not merely geographical. *Pragya* was not merely a piece of land but it was a *Pragya*—a nation which was ideally if not always actually a *Pragya* ('*Pragya*'). It also clearly followed that the culture that flourished in *Pragya* and the citizens thereof were *Pragya* men as they had done in the Vedic days. *Pragya* was the '*Pragya* *Pragya*' as distinguished from *Pragya* the land of the foreigners. However it must be clearly pointed out that the definition is not based on any ideological bias splitting or religious fanaticism. The word *Pragya* is especially used in this very sense to mean all those who had been incorporated as parts integral in the nation and people

what flourished on this our side of the *Pragya* whether *Pragya* or *Pragya*, and owned and claimed to have inherited a common culture, common blood, common country and common polity; while *Pragya* was by the very fact of its being put in opposition to *Pragya* meant foreigners nationally and racially and not merely religiously.

What is Hindutva.

This Royal Decree was an all Royal Decree in *Pragya* and generally been, the more extensive outcome of a strong and popular movement. For, the custom of looking upon now as the valuable Indian land's end to the very world the spiritless could not have been originated and observed so universally and so long, had it not been lighted by and appealing to our national imagination. This custom that is so tenaciously and reverently observed by millions of people, princes and peasants alike, is a good proof that through corroborates the fact that some royal edict sanctioning the identification of our frontier with the nation *Pragya* and associating the name of our land and nation with it as *Pragya* had actually been issued; and that the highest religious sanctification concerning this royal sanction and popular will must have enabled this attempt to restore the Vedic name of our country to triumph in the end. Of course centuries had yet to pass and centuries more to happen to shape and mould the destinies of the word *Pragya* and *Pragya* till they came to be as generally influential as to colour the thought of our whole nation and be the cherished possession of our race. But after all they have done it and today we find that while thousands would not know what *Pragya* or *Pragya* meant, yet the very men as the stream will understand and recognise the names *Pragya* and *Pragya* as his very own.

The views from *Pragya* quoted above seem to be quite trustworthy as far as their general purport is concerned : Family became they reveal a general tradition that, while doubt or ideological discussion, one easily be remembered longer. Secondly, independently of this, the general trend of our history as shown points to some such state of affairs. Thirdly, it is not necessary for our arguments to be very precise either about the date

Comments on English

But before we proceed to state what further developments the history of this epoch had in store for us, let it be without so reader as apology to ourselves. We have while writing this edition, wounded our own feelings. So we have to add that the few harsh words we had to say in explaining the political necessity that led to the rejection of Hindutva in India should not be understood to mean that we have not a very high opinion of that Church as a whole. No, no ! I am as humble an admirer and an adherent of that great and holy see—the holiest the world has ever seen—as any of its initiated worshippers. We are not irritated, not because the *Pragya* is not worthy of us, but because we are not

of this Decree in even the king by whom it was issued. And, for this, the author does not seem to have been writing about things only half-hazily or so which he is entirely a stranger. For the family sake that he gives of the House of *Vishvasiddhi* is again given us other part of the world and the two after closely with each other. The writer who knows of details about the House is likely to know the *Salvage* facts of the most distinguished king that belonged to it.

After all, the main resources of our history had been and must ever be our national traditions remembered or recorded in our ancient Puranas, Epics and Literature. Their details may be challenged, their dates determined and rejected, but on account of discrepancies here or inaccuracies elsewhere there which are in fact common to all ancient records of mankind, we cannot dismiss them altogether, especially when the sets recorded have not an impossible or impossible element in them or when they do not contradict events otherwise proved to be indisputably true. The habit of doubting everything in the Puranas till it has been corroborated by some foreign evidence is absurd. The sounder process would be to depend on our own especially where general traditions and events are concerned till they are found to be unreliable in the light of any more weighty and less ambiguous evidence and not simply on account of the airy imaginings of some one to whom it does not seem probable ! Take the case of this *Pragya* itself; because it contains some inaccuracies and even absurdities—and is Pharaoh free from them ? Are we to

worthy of stepping on the footstool of the Temple—that has lived longer because it rested on ideas than many a great pillar that rested on facts. The consciousness that the first great and the more successful attempt to wear man of the brute inherent in him was conceived, launched and carried on from century to century by a galaxy of great teachers, artists and thinkers who were born in India, who were bred in India and who owed India as the land of their worship—fills us with feelings too deep for words. And if these be our feelings for the men who shall we say about his great Founder—the Buddha—the Enlightened ? J. the bumblers of the double of mankind can dare to approach this, the *Pragya* ! With us, after all, we are not so humble and my utter eagerness. Although I feel that I fail to reach the purport of the words yet I know that it must be so. Because while the words are gathered from the lips of Gods, mine ears and my understandings are situated in the domain and the din of this materialistic world. Perhaps it was too soon for these to sound the march and unfurl the banner while the world was too young and the day but just then ! It fails to keep pace with them and its right gets dashed and dimmed to keep the radiance of the banner in full view. As long as the law of evolution that lays down the iron command

reject the personality of Alexander himself because of the supernatural touches given to the story of his birth ? Would it be reasonable to doubt, say the following verse :

सुगन्धं तु धर्मवर्धनं सुगन्धं

It is for me one of the greatest of pleasures to those Puranas and Epics that having preserved all ancient and venerable records of our people through revolutions which had effaced the very traces of whole nations and whole civilisations elsewhere in the world. For after all, these records of our ancient and patriotic poets and thinkers are as any more more faithful, more accurate and more reliable than the modern up-to-date western poets that have such convincing discrepancies to their credit as the one which states us that certain signs of the foundation of *Pragya* or the other which assume that *Pragya*... the Buddha was merely the Sea or the Dawn personified !

for the fight morally and militarily. The moral victory was won when Akbar came to the throne and Dara Shikoh was born. The former effort of Aurangzeb to revive their forgotten loss in the great field only inspired the loss of the military fortunes in the battle field as well. At last Shah, as if symbolically hampered the coming of the Imperial Seal of the Moghals to piece, the day of Panipat rose, the Hindus lost the battle, and won the war. Never again had an Afghan dared to penetrate to Delhi. While the (reigning) Hindu kings that our Marathas had carried to the Ark was taken up by our Sikhs and carried across the Indus to the banks of the Kabul.

Hindutva at work

In the prolonged furious conflict our people became instinctively conscious of ourselves as Hindus and were welded into a nation to an extent unknown in our history. It must not be forgotten that we have all along referred to the progress of the Hindu movement as a whole and not to that of any particular creed or religious position thereof—of Hindus and non-Hindus—only, Shaivism, Saktism, Sribh, Ayas, Anjeyas, Marthas, and Madras, Brahmins and Pariahs—all referred as Hindus and triumphed as Hindus. Such friends and foes contributed equally to enable the words Hindu and Hindutva to supersede all other designations of our land and our people. Warier and self-respect, vigour and fervour were given so eloquent an expression to the main political and cultural point at issue as the word Hindutva could do. All close on this side of India who claimed the land from the tip of the Ganges to the sea, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that one single expression Hindu. The enemies hated us as Hindus and the whole family of people and races, of sects and creeds that flourished from the tip of the Ganges to the sea, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that one single expression Hindu. The enemies hated us as Hindus and the whole family of people and races, of sects and creeds that flourished from the tip of the Ganges to the sea, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that one single expression Hindu. The enemies hated us as Hindus and the whole family of people and races, of sects and creeds that flourished from the tip of the Ganges to the sea, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that one single expression Hindu.

to defend the honour and independence of Hindutva and maintain the cultural unity and civil life of Hindus and non-Hindus alike, but Hindu—i. e., Hindu—that was being fought out on the hundred fields of battle as well as on the floor of the chambers of diplomacy. This one word Hindu was like a vital spinal cord through our whole body politic and made the blades of Malabar sweep over the sufferings of the Brahmins of Kashmir. One hard blow to the fall of Hindu, our tears traced the feelings of Hindu, our heroes fought the battles of Hindu, our times showed the efforts of Hindu, our men made the face of Hindu, our women wept over the wounds and grieved over the triumph of Hindu.

It would require a volume if we were to substantiate these remarks by quoting all the words and writings of our forefathers, then born on the point. But the argument in hand does not allow us to be drawn aside even by so alluring a task as that. Consequently we must content ourselves with quoting a few eloquent lines from the lips of the pen of some of the foremost representatives of our Hindu race.

Of all the works written in the Hindu language, old and new, the great epic 'Mahabharata' by Chandrabhaga is, so far as present standards go, admittedly the most majestic and authoritative one. There is only one solitary verse which claims to be an earlier composition. But luckily and strangely enough this very first composition in our Northern Vernacular literature refers to the words Hindutva in terms full of pride and passionate fervour. The poem in the form of a letter addresses the Raja of Varanasi, the father of Bharat—

मम नमः भगवते, नमः नमः नमः
नमः नमः नमः, नमः नमः नमः
नमः नमः नमः, नमः नमः नमः
नमः नमः नमः, नमः नमः नमः
नमः नमः नमः, नमः नमः नमः
नमः नमः नमः, नमः नमः नमः

भगवते, who may justly be called father of Hindu Hindutva, was the words 'Hindu, Hindu, Hindu' and so naturally

to have no doubt of their being quite common and accepted terms as far back as the eleventh century, when the Mahabharata had not received any permanent footing even in Punjab and therefore could not have influenced the independent and proud Bhagavats to adopt a derogating nickname imposed by their foes and rivals in their national and proud appellation. Describing how Bharat was taken prisoner by the Hindus, was let go by the noble Bhagavats on condition that he would not again attack the 'Hindus', we say—

‘तुम्हारे बंधन में मैं आया हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे
हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

(Bharat's words to the Hindus)

But Bharat was not a man to be won over by Hindu obsequy. Again and again he raised his head and flung his words to the boundaries of that divine Hindu race—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

and again—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

But in spite of his efforts to crush the Hindus, Bharat lost his way and the (imperial) power over Delhi and with it, that Bharat had once more taken Bharat to a prisoner. The prisoners greeted their king with—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

Further phrases solemnly uttered by the man who had broken the former pledge to suddenly drive, indicated in some

ing the release of the Shah once more, and once more, but not for the last time, did he leave Hindutva and by a full sword was aimed at the gate of Delhi. The counsel of war is summarised by the 'Mahabharata' Bhagavats, leaving challenges in turn by Bhagavats, the warriors and warriors are alike, when Bharat tells the Mahabharata Bhagavats to remain Shah of the Shah he had killed and said—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

The fatal day dawned over and both the sides knew it was a desperate game, Bharat's Bhagavats on the one of the death of the Bhagavats, approached the Bhagavats and opened his arms to a pathetic and to pathetic—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

After Bharat's Bhagavats the fatal result of the battle and consequent plot that enabled Bhagavats to strike Bhagavats dead, the war was with a last touching tribute to the Hindu Hindutva Emperor—

‘मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ
मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ, मैं तुम्हारे हस्त में हूँ’

It is remarkable that although the word Bharat appears often in the name in the sense of Bharat, yet it seldom appears, it is used in the sense of Bharat. What we find in this series of our Bharat's Bhagavats composition holds good to the later development of our Bharat's Bhagavats composition to the day of the great Hindu Revival and the war of Hindu Liberation. Bharat, the high priest and prophet of that movement, in one of his speeches and prophetic utterances of the vision he had seen and apprehended but truthfully asserts that much of what he had seen in his vision has already come to the truth—

कृष्ण, the Hindu poet who was one of the most prominent of our national bards that went up and down the country and poured "शिवदास" to school and college-going in those days of the year of Hindu liberation, challenged Britons —

^ In utter darkness I dream: behold, dreams are realized.
Hidradhion is up, has come by her own, and those that said
her soul virmed against God are put down with a strong hand!
Verily it is a holy land and happy! For, God has made her new
This town and Auzanagh is down! The delmood are appalled
and the enthured is destroyed. Actions speak better than
words! Verily ~~happier~~ is a holy land and happy: Now that will
be backed up by truth. Right by night, the waters of Judah,
no longer defiled, can make us once more to perfection our traditions
and statutes. Let come what may: Rema has made this land
holy and happy!

It was in this light that achievements of Bhilwaji and his companions were viewed by his race throughout Maharashtra. They thought not a word till he much proud of the victorious march of the Maratha warriors from Shivaji to Bajirao (vide *पुस्तक*) as they themselves did. He was, Hindu of Hindu and till the last day of his life he kept on singing his stirring songs celebrating the national and pan-Hindu aspect of the movement and imparting it to the rebels of his great leaders. Amongst these *संगीत*, the brave *भारत* King was his second favorite. —

‘द्विर’ इत्यत्र ‘वि’ नञ्, नैवत्वं तद्वत् सन्निधौ सन्निधौ
 सन्निधौ सन्निधौ सन्निधौ
 सन्निधौ सन्निधौ सन्निधौ
 सन्निधौ सन्निधौ सन्निधौ

Now was this infirm paid to copy and observe? कदापि न।
 Early this morning, राधापति, सुद पतिवर्धन - the 'दास द्विजशेखर' the
 looked upon himself as the incarnation of 'विष्णु' Says कदापि :-

॥ हिन्दु मुसलमानी वीर वीर ॥ गिरावले बोर भवा पालि नाथे ॥
लेखाये भुर भुल्लुन की वंशी ॥ कृष्णहि करिनि वखाने वीर ॥
पचले बासु तासकचर कटे ॥ वय री हिन्दुनी तो वर वाटे ॥
सुहृदकर जोरवनि मनाथे ॥ केव वेवाडे पिलर जग्याये ॥
ब्रह्म एकवत वीर गित नाथे ॥ ऐह करे मित वीरस बाथी हा
ऐह एक चिपरवनि नाथी ॥ करे जग्याये पचले बाथी ॥
जगद बलवाणी ब्रह्म वीर ॥ सगळी नाथि वय री जोर ॥

After his biological visit paid by Kuchaman to Jivapuri the young Bundela leader, greatly accompanied by the latter.

समय मुनासिब who was a powerful Rajput chief in Bandikhaland. In the conversation that followed मुनासिब draws a gloomy picture of the political situation of this country—

‘पातश्राद्ध’ नाथे करण, विपुलने श्रीनाथ
सुखि करि चंद्रशेखर को, लक्ष्मी देवता लोचु
बस है चरुचि करुणी वपारी, लक्ष्मी करुणी होवे शिवाजी.

१० * साक सादी विचारी के गरी कर्न केन केन वराम पलकाले ।
 हुनन हृषीं नरविजय हुनरे ज्यो हुन हरीं वर हरीं विजयलाले ॥
 विजय के पति सो न विजयत विजयक विजु नरीविन वराले ।
 श्रीजी कर्मक न विजयते के ज्ञानम ज्ञानम कर्मकविन नराले ॥

Again at another place it says :—

‘जबल मैं भीने महावीर कद्वारावन के
महाराज बनल हूँ बसमाह लेबाँ ।
पातझाड़ कापनी गिल्ली के पातझाड़ गिल्लीबनि
पांजलाह जीबो हिरुमधि केखने’

‘राधा के खाने की दासी’ खुश बरत
 बसी बात कहीं तब दिवसों की
 नहि नहि दिसा के तब की कलक रिकत पड़ी
 कलक ललकत दुखकासी
 दुखक कलक हिलचिलिपि पिल कलकका मुनिमुनि
 श्रवण शिखरक अलपलक
 मोड़ी बरि बंड़ी चिब मोड़ी के कलक बीम
 बीमो भासि संसारी बक गाढ़े बराने की॥’

Speaking of things that Shringi achieved **गुणन** **लग्नः**—

राखो मित्रराखो, मित्रराग के मित्रराग राखो,
मुनि कीज दुराग राखो कीज मित्र मुनि में
राखो रगुराखो रागदराखो राखो रागदराखो,
बामें बरग राखो राखो बुग दुरागें
भुवग बुगदराखो रूढ़ अरागदराखो, अगदराखो
नगराखो बरग नर मुनि में

1. 'Thou art so busy in winning easy victories over the poor Hindu Princes and Rulers there - Why dost thou fight so early to face the great himself? Thou hast lost four times over in the fair field here: what is perhaps why thou art discomfiting himself by pulling down unoffending innocents, scholars and chaste ones! Art thou not ashamed to call thyself a warrior - a conqueror of the world, when thyself standest vanquished by the Hindu Emperor Shikoh?

२. बर्फीली ३. बाघ के भण्डोली ४. रेवाजाम

बानी हुन बुद्धकी बोला, हो एते विदुष की बोला
बन बो बुन बने हतो बुझानी, हो फिर ओ भिदुष बानी "

बुद्धाणि the old Rajin, saying thus uttered he raved and
fumed, O bhaddara and blessed son, and his relation —

“एव वरिष्ठो भोजी ह्येव उवाच ॥ इति पाप विरहात् अपाई
भोजं ह्येष माधवर रात्रौ । पूरुष कश्चि ज्ञात आत्मनो
विदुषस्तस्य सा नार यजमनौ । दीर्घ दिशीदस्य कृष्णि हृत्पत्रो ”
(अथर्वशास्त्र)

Braveheart, the Great Guru who not only championed the cause of this war of Hindu Liberation in Punjab but laid down his life for it, is reported to have advised the Basmint of Kashmir, who oppressed and threatened with 'Jehem or death' seized his help —

तुम सुखो भिजेसु शिव तुमसु जाईसु बसवजो
 कन बीर हुवाय त्रिदु बाधे बाधिपाया लख पाधो
 हे तेचवझूरु पलात जवजवर ता जगार सुकं जवी
 शिव पाधे जव ही हव भिर लखी मल हे तुम

AND when he was challenged by the foes of the race and religion he boldly answered :—

‘किन से दुन की रसकलकुरा। चम किचकलुन किचे बलकलुर
रलर बलकलु चम हुन किचकलु। बलि रलकलु किचकलु किचकलु’^१

1. समग्रतः the historical works that describe the events of समग्रतः's reign, was composed under his direct orders by वासुदेवः.
2. Oh Brahmins! Listen, You go and tell the Turks (Musha-medas) without fear there is a great Hindu ruler of ours with less of followers. His name is Yog. Sambhadr-Ujjifor and a member of mankind-First make him a noble lady and then you will all do the same."

3. "Hearing there, Cuz Tag Malabon, the hero, the champion of us, made reply: 'How can I disregard be blind darkness—
to clear to my heart.'"

and some **पितृ**, but others or **युव**—we are all **Hindus** and own a common blood. Some of us are **श्री** and some **ब्रह्म**: but **श्री** or **जैन**—we are all **Hindus** and own a common blood. Some of us are **मुनिगो** some **चण्डाल**; some **क्षत्र** and some **अध्वर्यु**. But moonlight or subjects we are all **Hindus** and own a common blood. We are not only a **राष्ट्र** but a gift, a born brotherhood. Nothing else counts; it is after all a question of heart. We feel that the same ancient blood that coursed through the veins of **दाद** and **एक**, **युव** and **मर्त्य**, **श्री** and **भूत**, **युव** and **युव**, of **विष्णु** and **वैष्णव**, courses through our veins. We feel we are one, vein to vein, pulsates from heart to heart. We feel we are a gift, a race bound together by the dearest tie of blood—and therefore it must be so.

After all it is throughout this world so far as man is concerned but a single race—the *Flowen* race; kept alive by one common blood the *Fuma* blood. All other races are but man provisioned, a stark skin and only relatively true. Nature is constantly trying to overthrow the artificial barriers you raise between race and race. Yet to prevent the commingling of blood is to hold on death. Sexual attraction has proved more powerful than all the constraints of all the prophets put together. Even as it is even the aborigines of the *Andamans* are without some sprinkling of the so-called *white* blood in their veins, and were never. Truly speaking all that any one of us can claim, all that history entitles one to claim, is that one has the blood of all mankind in one's veins. The fundamental unity of man from pole to pole is true—all else only relatively so.

And speaking relatively alone, no people in this world, said more justly claim to get recognized for a racial unit than the Hindus and perhaps the Jews. A Hindu, marrying a Hindu wife, loses his caste but not his figure. A Hindu believing in any (sect, school or philosophical or social) system, orthodox or heterodox, provides it is unquestionably indigenous and founded by a Hindu may lose his sect but not his figure—his Hinduism—because the most important essential which determines it is the inheritance of the Hindu blood. Therefore all those who love the land that stretches from Riga to Rangoon, from Indus to Siam, as their Fatherland consequently claim to inherit the blood of the race that has evolved, by incorporation and adoption, from the sacred soil.

can be said to possess two of the great essential requisites of
 life.

Common info

[illegible]

What is distribution?

But what is civilization? Civilization is the expression of the mind of man. Civilization is the accompaniment of what man has made of matter. If matter is the creation of the Lord, then civilization is the miniature secondary creation of man. As his best it is the perfect triumph of the soul of man over matter and matter alike. Wherever and to the extent to which man has succeeded in

...enjoying mother to the delight of his soul, civilization begins. And it triumphs when he has tapped all the sources of Supreme Delight satisfying the Spiritual Aspirations of his Being towards strength and beauty and love, realizing life in all its fulness and richness.

The story of the civilization of a nation is the story of its thoughts, its action and its achievements. Literature and art tell us of its thoughts; history and social institutions of its actions and achievements. In none of these can there remain isolated. The primitive self (Caucas) of the Andamanese can truly claim to have influenced the up-to-date dress-dresses of America. The latest advances of fashion-mongers the fair sex in Paris is but the direct descendant of the bunch of leaves worn in the single-string which constitutes the possession of a totem of a "great" bird.

And yet a 'Qingli' remains a Qingli and a 'dreadnought', a 'dreadnought'; they are too much more unlike each other than 100 to be identified as one and the same. Even so, although the Hindkas have less much and homogenous much like any other people yet, their civilisation is too characteristic to be mistaken for any other cultural unit. And secondly, however sinking their mutual difference be, they are 100 much more like each other than unlike, to be denied the right of being recognised as a cultural unit amongst other such units in the world owning a common history, a common literature and a common civilisation.

merely that a common civilization.

It may sound to those who have fallen victims to the interested or ignorant views now secured, the present world that the Hindus have no history;—that they remain as they think Hindus are about the only people who have succeeded in preserving their history—riding through earthquakes, burning over deluges? It begins with their Vedas which are the first extant deposit of the story of our race. The last grand saga that every Hindu girl listens to sing of Sita, the good. Some of its worshiping name as an incarnation, some admire him as a hero and a warrior, all love him as the most illustrious representative member of our race. Manu and Bhishma are the never failing members of our race. They are the parallel to the Hindu youth; Rama and Duryodana, the never ending feud between the young; Krishna and Arjuna, the never ending feud between the young; the story of the Hindu gods. The love that first made us the Divine Coward in Gokul told its story whether a Hindu, later Hindu,

[illegible]

But what about the intercaste wars amongst Hindus? We sever, what about the wars of Rome amongst the English? What of intercaste struggles of states against states, seen against debt, class against class, each invoking foreign help against his own countrymen, in Italy, in Germany, in France, in America? Are they still *his* people, a nation, and do they possess a common history? If they do, the Hindus do. If the Hindus do not possess a common history then none in the world does.

As His History tells the story of Actions of our men so does our literature tell in its fullest way the story of the Thoughts of our race. Through they may be inspired by our common togetherness, the singer. Verily it is our mother-tongue—the tongue in which the mothers of our race spoke and which has given birth to all our present tongue. Our Gods spoke in song, our sages thought in song, our poets wrote in song. All that is best in us—the best thoughts, the best ideas, the best words—seek instinctively to clothe itself in song. To millions it is still the language of their Gods; to

[illegible]

The works of art and architecture are also a common inheritance of our race, whether they be representative of *Śaiva* or *Śākya* school of thought. For all the laborers who wrought them, the masters who guided them, the 12-*paṣaṇa* who flourished them and the kings who organised them, whether *Śaiva* or *Śākya* belonged to the great race that inhabits and owns this land from *ṣiṅ* to *ṣiṅ*-the Hindu race. Those who are *śaṅkṣita* today have contributed and laboured for the *śiṅkṣita* monuments of art and architecture then while those who were *Buddhista* then have contributed to and laboured for the monuments of the *śaṅkṣita* art and architecture now.

Common laws and rules

Common institutions and a common law they possess and sanctify; but however they may differ in details are nevertheless

less both the cause and the effect of the basic unity of our people. The Hindu law with the underlying principles of Hindu Jurisprudence, therefore, the superficial differences be and however contradictory a detail here or an injunction, they may seem to be, is too organic a growth to lose its individuality by the manifold changes wrought by times and climes. In spite of the lavish spend with which the law ministers in the different states of America and British Commonwealth keep manufacturing and amending laws we still acknowledge the principles of Jurisprudence and the lines of growth that underlie their code to constitute a single whole. The English law, or the Roman Jurisprudence or the American law may be different, but the same or current identical principles of Jurisprudence is expected. The Mohammedan law retains its individuality despite of such damaging exceptions to it as the Khajiras or the Bohras who like some other Mohammedan communities, observe the Hindu law as regulating some departments of their life, notably in matters of inheritance. Some of the Hindu customs in Maharashtra or Punjab may differ from some in Bengal or Sind. But the similarity in all other details is so great that the law of the Mohammedans as a whole seems to be an echo of the law book telling our brothers in Bengal or Sind to give respect Where all the rules, customs and usages are by and by to be working but a distant chord of the Hindu law while no amount of ingenuity or tortuous law fit as they, the English, or Mohammedan or the Japanese law books.

[illegible]

referred to any justification or even an illusion in its religious aspect or significance. Because we wanted to deal with the question of "Type" not in the light of any "type" but from a racial point of view and yet come from a national and racial point of view, we did the different places of pilgrimage constitute, a common inheritance of our Hindu race. The Bharat as a Bharat, the Bharat as a Bharat, the Bharat as a Bharat, all these great gatherings had been the real and living organisms of our people that kept the current of life and the thought constant throughout our body politic. The gods and goddesses and the sacred places, the sacred places, observed by some of the religious, by others, the sacred places, impress upon each individual that he can live best only through the common and comparative life of the Hindu race.

These then in short—and the subject in hand does not permit us to be exhaustive on this point—constitute the essence of our civilization and mark us out on a cultural wall. We Hindus are not only a *stupa*, a *stūpa*, but also a consecrator of being both, even a common *stūpa* embodied, preserved thereby and originally through *stūpa*, the real Mother-tongue of our race. Every one who is a Hindu inherits this *stūpa* and owes his spiritual being to it no truly as he owes his physical one to the land and the blood of his forefathers.

A Hindu feels that he who feels attachments to the land, that extends from fog to fog as the land of his forefathers—in his Fatherland, who inherits the blood of the great race whose fair and discernible source could be traced by the Maimanai altitudes of the Vedic writings and which assimilating all that was incorporated into the *Samudra* as the Hindu people has grown into and come to be known as the Hindu people, and who, as a consequence of the foregoing altitudes, has purified and as a consequence of the foregoing altitudes, the Hindu of India is represented as his own the Vedic people, the Hindu of India is represented as common history, common heritage, a common literature, a common art, a common law and a common jurisprudence, common laws and customs, rites and rituals, sacraments and sacraments. Not that, every Hindu has all these details of the Hindu scriptural texts to which only applies common with other Hindus; but that, he has more of it with common with his Hindu brethren with this, say, an Arab or an Englishman. Not that a non-Hindu does not hold

any of these deeds in common with a Hindu but that he differs from a Hindu that he agrees with. That in any Christian and Mohammedan communities, who were but very recently Hindus and in majority of cases had been at least in their first generation poor wandering denizens of their new fold, claim though they might have a common Fatherland, and an almost pure Hindu blood and paragon with us, cannot be recognized as Hindus; as, since their adoption of the new faith they had ceased to own Hindu *Samiti* as a whole. They belong, or feel that they belong, to a cultural unit altogether different from the Hindu one. Their heroes and their hero-worship, their fairs and their festivals, their ideals and their mode-of-life, have now ceased to be common with one another. Thus the presence of this Hindu over-tone of type in one's mind, which is the result of a long and loving attachment to his race and of a long unbroken as most perfectly to determine the nature of firm without any danger of using over-estimate or excessive exaggeration.

But takes the case of a pariahs' Bohra or a Khasia convert-men of ayea. He loves one land of Egypt or his Fatherland which indisputably, is the land of his forefathers. He possesses—in certain cases they do—pure Hindu blood; especially if he be the first convert to Mohammedanism he must be allowed in claim to inherit the blood of Hindu parents. He is an intelligent and reasonable man, loves our history and our heroes, in fact the Bohras use the Khasia as a community, worship as Hindus and are in fact Hindus. He is a Khasia, a Hindu, a Mohammedan. He is actually, along with his community subject to the Hindu law—the law of his forefathers. He is, so far as the three essentials of race, caste and religion are concerned, a Hindu. He may differ as regards a few festivals or may add a few more heroes to the pantheon of his ancestors or demigods. But we have repeatedly said that difference in details here or emphasis there, does not throw us outside the pale of Hindu society. The sub-communication amongst the Hindus always means a caste, not only contradictory but even conflicting with customs of other Hindu communities. The Hindu law is not a Hindu law, it is a Hindu law of a pariahs' Bohra or a Christian or a Khasia, who could satisfy the required qualifications of Egypt to such a degree as he, who should he not be recognized as a Hindu?

He would certainly have been recognised as such but for his attitude towards a single detail—which, though it is covered by the words *धर्म* or culture, is yet too important to be lost in the multitude of other attributes, and therefore deserves a special treatment and analysis; which again brings us face to face with the question which, involving as it does the religious aspect of Hindutva, had often been avoided by us. Not because we fight shy of it, but on account of our wish to fight it out all the more thoroughly and effectively. For, we are now better equipped to determine the significance and attempt an analysis of the two terms *Hindutva* and *हिन्दुत्व*.

* * *

Who is a Hindu ?

The words *हिन्दु* and *Hinduism* being both of them derived from the word *हिन्दु* must necessarily be understood to refer to the whole of the Hindu people. Any definition of Hinduism that leaves out any important section of our people and forces them either to play false to their convictions or to go outside the pale of *हिन्दु* stands self-condemned. *Hindutva* means the system of religious beliefs found common amongst the Hindu people. And the only way to find out what those religious beliefs of the Hindus are, i. e., what constitutes *Hinduism*, you must first define a Hindu. But forgetting this chief implication of the word *Hinduism* which clearly presupposes an independent conception of a Hindu, many a people go about to determine the essentials of *Hinduism*, and finding once so satisfactory as to include, without overlapping all our Hindu communities, come to the desperate conclusion—which does not satisfy themselves—that therefore those communities are not Hindus at all ! Because—not that the definition they had framed is open to the fault of excluding but because—those communities do not subject themselves to the required tests which these gentlemen have thought fit to table as 'Hinduism'. This way of answering the question 'who is a Hindu' is truly preposterous and has given rise to so much of bitterness amongst some of our brethren of various schools of thought, the *हिन्दु*, the *वैष्णव*, the *शैव* and even our painless and progressive *प्रगतिवादी*.

'Who is a Hindu ?'—he who is subject to the tenets of *Hinduism*. Very well ! What is *Hinduism* ?—those tenets to which the Hindus are subjected ! This is very nicely arguing in a circle and can never lead to a satisfactory solution. Many of our friends who have been on this wrong track have come back to tell us 'there is no such people as Hindus at all !' If some friend, as gifted as the Englishman who first coined the word *Hinduism*, coins a parallel word 'Englishism' proceeds to find out the underlying unity of beliefs amongst the English people, gets disgusted with thousands of sects and societies from Jews to the Jesuits, from Trinitarians to Unitarians, and comes out to announce that 'there are no such people as the English at all !' he would not make himself more ridiculous than those who declare in cold print 'there is nothing as a Hindu people.' Any one who aims to see what a confusion of thought prevails on the point and how the failure to analyse separately the two terms *हिन्दु* and *Hinduism* renders that confusion worst confounded may do well to go through the booklet 'Essentials of Hinduism' published by the enterprising 'Harems and Co.'

Hinduism means the faith of the Hindu; and as the word *Hindu* has been derived from the word *हिन्दु*, the *Hindu*, meaning primarily all the people who reside on the land that extends from *हिन्दु* to *हिन्दु*, *Hinduism* must necessarily mean the religion or the religious that are peculiar and native to this land and this people. If we are unable to reduce the different creeds and beliefs to a single system of religion then the only way would be to cease to maintain that *Hinduism* is a system and to say that it is a set of systems consistent with, or if you like, contradictory or even conflicting with, each other. But in no case can you advance this your failure to determine the meaning of *Hinduism* as a ground to doubt the existence of a Hindu Nation itself, or worse still to commit sacrilege in hurting the feelings of our *सच्चे हिन्दु* brethren and *सच्चे हिन्दु* brethren alike, by relegating any of them to the Non-Hindu pale.

The limits of this essay do not permit us to determine the nature or the necessity of *Hinduism* as to try to discuss it in any great length. As we have shown above the enquiry into what is *Hinduism* can only begin after the question 'who is a Hindu' is

rightly answered determining the essentials of *हिन्दुत्व*; and as it is only with these essentials of *हिन्दुत्व*, which enable us to know who is a Hindu, that our present enquiry is concerned, the discussion of *Hinduism* falls necessarily outside of our scope. We have to take cognizance of it only so far as it responds in the field of our special charge. *Hinduism* is a word that properly speaking should be applied to all the religious beliefs that the different communities of the Hindu people hold. But it is generally applied to that system of religion which the majority of the Hindu people follow. It is natural that a religion of a country or community should derive its name from the characteristic feature which is common to an overwhelming majority that constitutes or contributes to it. It is also convenient for easy reference or parlance. But a convenient term that is not only delusive but harmful and positively misleading should not any longer be allowed to blind our judgement. The majority of the Hindus constitutes no that system of religion which could fully be described by the attribute that constitutes its special feature, as 'सत्त्वगुणरजस्तमः' *सत्त्व* or *सत्त्वगुण*. They would not object if it even be called *सत्त्वगुण*. But besides these there are other Hindus who reject either partly or wholly, the authority—some of the *ग्रन्थ*, some of the *स्मृति* and some of the *वैष्णव*, themselves. But if you identify the religion of the Hindus with the religion of the majority only and call it orthodox *Hinduism*, then the different heterodox communities, being Hindus themselves rightly resent this usurpation, of *हिन्दुत्व* by the majority as well as their unjustifiable exclusion. The religion of the minorities also requires a name. But if you call the so-called orthodox religion alone as *Hinduism* then naturally it follows that the religion of the so-called heterodox is not *Hinduism* ! The real root of the fatal error being that, therefore, those sects are not Hindus at all ! But this inference seems as staggering even to those who had unwittingly given whole-hearted support to the premises which have made it logically inescapable that while having to own it they hardly know how to avoid arriving at it. And thus we find that while millions of our Shukla, Jains, Jagesh, severs, Sanyasis and others would deeply resent to be told that they—whose fathers' fathers up to the tenth generations had the blood of Hindus in their veins—had suddenly ceased to be Hindu !—yet a section amongst them takes it most emphatically for granted that they

had been faced with a choice that either they should consent to be a party to those customs and beliefs which they had in their pastime or progressive zeal rejected as superstitious, or they should cease to belong to that race to which their forefathers belonged.

All this bitterness is mostly due to the wrong use of the word *Hinduism* to denote the religion of the majority only. Either the word should be reserved to its proper significance to denote the religion of all Hindus or if you fail to do that it should be dropped altogether. The religion of the majority of the Hindus could be best denoted by the ancient accepted appellation, the *सत्त्वगुण* or the *सत्त्वगुणरजस्तमः* or the *सत्त्वगुण*, while the religions of the remaining Hindus would continue to be denoted by their respective and accepted names *सत्त्वगुण* or *सत्त्वगुण* or *सत्त्वगुण* or *सत्त्वगुण*. Whenever the necessity of denoting these *सत्त्वगुण* as a whole exists then alone we may be justified in denoting them by the generic term *हिन्दुत्व* or *Hinduism*. Thus there would be no loss either in clearness, or in consistency but on the other hand a gain both in precision and unambiguity which by removing the cause of suspicion in our minor communities and resentment in the major ones would once more unite as all Hindus under one ancient banner representing a common race and a common civilisation.

The earliest records that we have got of the religious beliefs of any Indian community—not to speak of mankind itself—are the Vedas. The Vedic nation of the *सत्त्वगुण* was sub-divided into many a tribe and class. But although the majority then held a faith that we for simplicity call 'Vedic religion', yet it was not corroborated to by an important minority of the *सत्त्वगुण* themselves. The *सत्त्वगुण*, the *सत्त्वगुण*, the *सत्त्वगुण* and many others from time to time seem to have either seceded from or never belonged to the orthodox church and yet racially and nationally they were conscious of being a people by themselves. There was such a thing as Vedic religion, but it could not be even identified with *सत्त्वगुण*. For the latter term, had it been coined would have naturally meant the set of religions prevailing in *सत्त्वगुण*, orthodox as well as heterodox. By a process of elimination and assimilation the race of the *सत्त्वगुण* at last grew into the race of *हिन्दुत्व*—and the land of the

all the essentials of *Hindu* and had been forcibly snatched out of our ancestral Home by the hand of Violence—ye, have only to render whole-hearted love to our common Mother and her religion: see not only as *Hindu* but even as a *guru*, and ye would be most welcome to the Hindustan.

This is a choice which our country-men and our old Hindu and Kshatriya, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Khajira, Khajira and other Mohammedan and Christian communities are free to make—a choice again which must be a choice of love. But as long as they are not minded thus, so long they cannot be recognised as Hindus. We are it must be remembered trying to analyse and determine the essentials of *Hindu* as that word is actually understood to signify and would not be justified to strain it in its application to suit any preconceived notions or party convenience.

A Hindu, therefore, to sum up the conclusions arrived at, is he who looks upon the land that extends from *Hindu* to *Hindu*, from the Indus to the Sea, as the land of his Forefathers—the *Hindu*, who inhales the blood of that race whose first discernible source could be traced to the Vedic *Hindu* and which on its onward march, assimilating much that was incorporated and absorbing much that was assimilated, has come to be known as the Hindu people, who has inherited and claims as his own, the culture of that race, as expressed chiefly in their common *Hindu* language, the *Hindu* and represented by a common history, a common literature, art and architecture, law and jurisprudence, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments, faith and festivals; and who above all addresses this land, the *Hindu*, as his *Hindu*, his *Hindu*—the land of his prospects and fears, of his godmen and gods, the land of piety and pilgrimage. These are the essentials of *Hindu*—a common race, a common faith, and a common worship. All these essentials could best be summed up by saying in brief that he is a *Hindu* to whom *Hindu* is not only a *Hindu* but also a *guru*. For the first two essentials of *Hindu*—*Hindu* and *Hindu*—are clearly denoted and embodied by the word *Hindu*; while the third essential of *Hindu* is pre-eminently implied by the word *guru*, as it is precisely *Hindu* including *Hindu*, i. e. rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments, that makes a land a Holy land. To make the definition more handy, we may be allowed to compress it in a couplet:—

महिषीभूतनामकं वरुणवर्षात् ।
विष्णुः कुरुक्षेत्रे न भू विदुर्नित्यम् ॥

Hindu is Hindu

Through analysis to which the conception of *Hindu* was subjected in the foregoing pages has enabled us to frame a working definition embodying or rather indicating the relevant essentials of it. It now remains to see how far this general definition can stand a detailed examination that would be best conducted by testing a few typical and some of the more different cases which have in fact made the necessity of a definition so badly felt. While developing it we have tried at each step to free it, so far as it is possible to do so in the case of so comprehensive and elusive a generalization as that, from the defect of being over-lapping. If we find in testing a few typical cases in the light of this definition that they all fit in well then we may be sure that it is free from the opposite defect of exclusiveness too. We have seen that it is not open to criticism; it remains to be seen whether it is not open to *Hindu* also.

The geographical divisions that obtain amongst the *Hindu* world, at a glance, be seen to harmonise well with the spirit of our definition. The fundamental basis of it is the land *Hindu*—*Hindu*, and although many of our brethren, and especially those who had been the most undoubted descendants of the ancient *Hindu* and who besides are the very people that to this day have never changed the ancient name either of their land or of their race, and are called to day as five thousand years ago, *Hindu*, the children of *Hindu*, inhabit on either bank of the Indus yet, as in the mention of a river the mention of both its banks is implied as a matter of course so that part of *Hindu* which constitutes the western bank of Indus is a natural part of *Hindu* and is covered by our definition. Secondly, accessories to the mainland are always known by the name of the latter. And thirdly, our *Hindu* people on that side of the Indus have throughout history looked upon this land of *Hindu* as their real *Hindu* as well as *guru*. They had never been guilty of intericide in attempting to set up the pitch they inhabit as their only *Hindu* or only *guru*. On the other hand their *Hindu* and *Hindu* are our *Hindu* and *Hindu* and *Hindu*. From the Vedic time they are a part integral of

ancestral, *Hindu* is mentioned in *Hindu* and *Hindu* as the rightful constituents of the great *Hindu* confederacy and commonwealth. They belong to our *Hindu*, to our *Hindu* and to our *Hindu*. Therefore they are *Hindu* and their case is well covered by our definition.

But even if one rejects the contention that the ownership of a river does imply, unless otherwise stated, the ownership of both its banks yet the definition remains as sound as ever and applies to our *Hindu* brethren on other grounds. For, apart from the special case of our *Hindu* brethren that inhabit on the other side of the Indus, there are hundreds of thousands of *Hindu* who have settled in all parts of the world. A time may come when these our *Hindu* colonists, who even to-day are the dominating factor in trade, numbers, capacity and intellect in their respective lands, may come to own a whole country and form a *Hindu* state. But will this simple fact of residence in lands other than *Hindu* render one a non-*Hindu*? Certainly not; for the first essential of *Hindu* is not that a man must not reside in lands outside India, but that wherever he or his descendants may happen to be he must recognise *Hindu* as the land of his forefathers. May more; it is not a question of recognition either. If his ancestors came from India as *Hindu* he cannot help recognising India as his *Hindu*. So this definition of *Hindu* is compatible with any conceivable expansion of our *Hindu* people. Let our colonists continue unabated their labours of founding a Greater India, a *Hindu* to the last of their capacities and contribute all that is best to our civilization to the benefit of humanity. Let them enrich the people that inhabit the earth from Pole to Pole with their virtues and let them in return enrich their own country and race by inheriting all that is healthy and true wherever found. *Hindu* does not clip the wings of the *Hindu* eagles but only adds to their length. So long as ye, O *Hindu*, look upon *Hindu* as the land of your forefathers and as the land of your prospects, and cherish the glorious heritage of their culture and their blood, so long nothing can stand in the way of your desire to expand. The only geographical limits of *Hindu* are the limits of our earth.

So far as the racial aspect of our definition is concerned we cannot think of any conception that can seriously challenge its validity. Just as in England we find Iberians, Keltic, Angles,

Saxons, Danes, Normans now fused in spite of the racial restrictions on intermarriage into one nation, so the widest racial distinctions of Aryans, Kolarians, Dravidians and others even if they had ever been keen, can no longer be recognised. We have dealt with the point as exhaustively as necessary in the foregoing pages and pointed out that the *Hindu* and *Hindu* systems recognised in our lawbooks bear indisputable testimony to the fact that a fusion sufficient to keep the flow of common blood through our body politic vigorous and fresh was even then an accomplished fact. Nature again broke the barriers where custom refused to pull them down in time. *Hindu* was neither the first nor the last of Aryans to make love with a *Hindu*, nor the Brahmin lady the mother of *Hindu*, to whom we have referred already, was the only Aryan girl that took a fancy to a *Hindu* youth. Out of a dozen *Hindu* as Kelly or even *Hindu*, a youth or a girl may at times be picked up and dropped in a city school without any fear of being recognised as such either by a playful or by a moral test. The fact that is born of the fusion, which on the whole is a healthy one, because gradual, of the Aryans, Kolarians, Dravidians and all those of our ancestors, whose blood was as a race inherited, is rightly called neither an Aryan, nor Kolarian, nor Dravidian—but the *Hindu* race; that is, the people who live as children of a common motherland, adorning a common holyland—the land that lies between the *Hindu*. Therefore the *Hindu*, *Hindu*, *Hindu*, *Hindu*, *Hindu* and all other Hindu tribes and classes are *Hindu*. This *Hindu* is as emphatically, if not more emphatically, the land of their forefathers as of those of the so-called Aryans; they inherit the *Hindu* blood and the *Hindu* culture, and even those of them who have not as yet come fully under the influence of any orthodox *Hindu* sect, do still worship deities and saints and follow a religion, however primitive, are still purely absorbed in this land, which therefore to them is not only a Fatherland but a Holyland.

There would have been no serious objection raised against the spiritual aspect of *Hindu* too, but for the unfortunate misunderstanding that arose in origin in the confusing similarity between the two terms *Hindu* and *Hindu*. We have tried already to draw clear line of demarcation between the two conceptions and protested against the wrong use of the word

Hinduism to denote the narrow field alone. There is no idealisation with figures; nor is there idealisation with Hinduism. This broad-based Hinduism is the Hinduism which figures with figures and both with arguments and is justly resented by our more narrow sects or religious systems and goods a small section of people amongst them—want to explode this mistaken notion, but unfortunately to commit another grave and suicidal mistake, to the opposite direction and disown their figure itself. We hope that our definition will leave no ground for any such intention of feelings on either side and based on truth as it is, would be acknowledged by all the fair-minded people throughout our Hindu Society. And as for the general treatment of this question, we have to follow the rule of any special case, that is to say, let us first take the case of our first hero, Krishna. No one could be so silly as to contrast the statements, that Krishna, "sitting Krishna was अवस्थित", is their Fatherland—the land that ever since the first extant records of the Vedic Period has been the land where their forefathers lived and loved and worshipped and prayed. Secondly, they most undoubtedly inherit the Hindu blood in their veins as much as any one in Hindost or Bengal does. Nay more, while we Hindus in Maharashtra or Bengal inherit the blood of the Aryans as well as of those other ancient people who inhabited this country, the Sikhs are the ultimate, direct descendants of the Aryans. They and claim to have inherited the same blood as the very fountain of this Germanic-Hindu life before he had descended down to the plains of India. Thirdly, they have contributed and therefore are the rightful ancestors in our Hindu culture. For सम्राट् was a river in the Punjab before she became the Deified Ganga of Learning and Art. To this day, do millions of Hindus throughout Hindostan join in the exultant shout with which the King, your fatherland, or Sikhs, paid the tribute of a grateful people to, and attested the glories of the River on whose banks the first seeds of our Culture and Civilization were sown and reaped. The Rigveda accents this "वसिष्ठं नमस्कृत्य" "हो वसिष्ठं नमस्कृत्य" "The Vedas were there that they are the first giant struggle of Man to tap the sources of Nature. The first giant struggle of Light against the forces of Darkness and ignorance, that had stolen and kept imprisoned the sacred water and refused to allow the rays of

Bluntly Indian youth men and respect the position. The story of the Sikhs, like any one of us must begin with the Vedus, pass on through the palates of Ayodhya, witness the banishment of Rama, help to lay the foundation of Lalotane and watch prince Parit leave the confines of Ashvamedh and enter the arena in Indus valley way out to capture the vicinities of Mko. The Sikhs along with us bear all the fate of grief, share the fate of a conquered people, and suffer together as Hindus. Millions of Sikh-asthis, Sperm, the Spermatozoa and the blood cells adore the Urdu language not only as the language of their ancestors but as the sacred language of their land. While the rest recognize it only as the language of their fathers, the Sikhs regard it as the language of their fathers who yet in its infancy is still nursing the milk of life at its source. Lastly, the hard word Urdu is not only the first bond which the Sikhs, Guru Manak and Guru Govind, the Singh Bards and Ramtani were born and bred in Hindustan; the Larks of Hindustan are the Larks of better and of Freedom—*निराशा* and *प्रेम*; the land of Hindustan is the land of prophets and *प्राज्ञ*—*प्राज्ञ* and *प्राज्ञ*. Really if any community in India is Hindu beyond, above or criticism it is our Sikh brotherhood in the Punjab, being almost the indigenous dwellers of the land and the land itself. The Sikhs are the Hindu people. You Sikhs, to-day is the Hindu of yesterday and the Hindu of to-day may be the Sikh of tomorrow. The change of a dress, or a creed, or a detail of daily life cannot change the blood or the term, nor can efface and blot out history itself.

To the millions of our Sikh Brothers their agony is self-evident. The *Shikharis*, *Araks*, *Yatris*, *Shikharis* and the *Yatris* Sikhs are proud of being *Hindus* by race and by nationality. As their *Gurus* themselves had been the children of *Hindus* they would find it *unfathomable* if at any recent any words attempt to class them as *Non-Hindus*. The *Yatris* is still by the *Yatris* as well as by the *Shikharis* as a sacred object, both of them have been for as long as *Yatris* is common. The *Sikhs* of the *Yatris* are not so far as *Yatris* as their population is concerned, are equally *Yatris* to their racial appellation and live amongst *Hindus* as *Hindus*. It cannot be by shocking to them to be told that they had suddenly ceased to be *Hindus*. Our racial Unity is unshakened, and remains to be

Incenseburning is quite common among the Sikhs and

The first is that the primal truth is at all times realized by some Indians of one Sikh brotherhood against their being taught as Hindhis; would never have been heard of the term Hindutva; was not allowed to get identical with Saivismism. This contention of Jagan and the vagueness of expression resulting therefrom, are at the root of this fatal verbiage; this once at times the cardinal principle of the Hindhis, is now the cardinal principle of the Hindhis; have tried to make it clear like foggy is not to be determined by any theological tests. You must repeat it once more that the Hindhis are free to reject any or all things they dislike as superfluous in themselves, even the binding authority of the Vedas as a revelation; they themselves may be called as Hindhis, but cannot be called as Hindhis; the Hindhis are not to be determined by the light of right and not any religious sense whatever. Religiosity they are Sikhs as Jains are Jains, Jangams are Jangams, Vaishnavas are Vaishnavas; but none of us racially and nationally and nationality are a policy and a people, one and indivisible, and we are not to be determined by the light of right and wrong; we can express our social idealism; even though we can do that as freedom deals with all the foregoing pages. **गान्धेजी** expresses an idealism and expresses a higher generalization; but cannot express social unity of all Hindhis. We are Sikhs and Hindhis and Jangams. We are all three put together and १९०९

Another reason besides this fear of being incited with the followers of ~~anyone~~ which added to zeal of some of our Sikh Brothers and those then active on gaining classed separately as non-Hindus, was political fear. This is not the phase of existing in a state of elements of a special representation. The Sikh are naturally patriotic and the special interests of their community and if the Mahatmas could enjoy the privilege of a special and concerned representation, we do not understand why any other important minority in India should not claim similar concessions. But we feel that the claim should not have been backed up by our Sikh Brothers by any untimely and untidily kind of being non-Hindus. Sikhs, to guard their own interests

would have good reason for, and sustained in seeing racial and communal representation on the ground of being an important minority as our ennoblements and other communities have done without renouncing their birthright of Tegu. Our Sikh brothers hold in eminence as a first important community from the Mahatma's point of view. They are the only community in India who are non-Hindu Community in India. The basis that a special communal representation does is better so great as the harm done by the attitude of racial aloofness. For the Sikhs, the Jains, the Lingayats, the non-Brahmins and even, for the answer of time, the Muslims, the representation is not a representation of their representation, if they merely look upon it as indispensable for their communal growth. For their growth is the growth of the whole Hindu-Society. Even in ancient times one finds many castes and communities, who were not so much on communal basis as our community of Sikhs is to be seen in legal form. They were distinguished without refusing to get fused into the larger whole and incorporated into the wider generalization of light. Let the Sikhs be viewed as Sikhs religiously, but as Hindus racially, uniquely and

[illegible]

Memorized with the stunts of Colonel. Verily Blind is the richly endowed daughter of God.

Neither the English nor the French—with the exception of
 Chinese and perhaps the Americans, no people are gifted with a
 land that can equal in natural strength and richness the land of
 Argentina. A country, a common bond in the first important concep-
 tion of earth's unity; and so of all countries in the
 world our country can hardly be surpassed by any in its capacity
 to afford a soil so specially fitted for the growth of a great nation;
 we find whose very first article of faith is (as you we hear in
 the common motto), have in that love the strongest incentive
 that our land could and keep a nation firm and endeavor
 enable it to accomplish things greater than ever.

The economic situation of Egypt puts the estimates of our latest powers of material culture and organized yet higher. The country in the world with the exception of China again, is peopled by a race so homogeneous, yet so ancient and yet so strong both materially and vitally. The Americans have yet to stand before equally fortunate with us so far as the gift of an excellent geographical basis of nationality is concerned, are decidedly behind. Mohammedans are no race nor are the Christians. They are a religious unit, yet neither a racial nor a national one. They are, if possible, the best of the three put together, and live under our ancient and common roof. The numerical strength of our race is so much that cannot be too highly prized.

And culture? The English and the Americans feel they are both lost and because they possess a Shakespeare in common. But not only a Kalidasa or a Bhas, but Oh Hindu! You possess the Ramayan and Mahabharat in common—and the Vedas! One of the national songs the American children are taught to sing attempts to recapitulate their sense of eternal and important by pointing out to the hundred years twice told, slow stand behind their history. The Hindu regards his years not by centuries but by cycles—the *yo* and the *yo*—and assumes rule

THE STATE OF NEW YORK: SENATE, JANUARY 12, 1892.

सुखं न भवति ।

He does not attempt to raise the issue of self-superiority so much as the issue of proportion which is Truth. And that has

symples made him last longer than Remus and Nebuchadnezzar. If a people that had no past has no future, that a people that had produced an unending galaxy of heroes and hero-worshippers are who are conscious of having fought with and vanquished the forces whose might struck Queen and Ruler, the Pharaoh and the local deity, have in their history a guarantee of their future greatness more assuring than any other people on earth yet achieved.

But besides culture the tie of common history lies at times even stronger than the chains of a Motherland. Look at the Mohabads. Meets to them is a sterner reality than Delhi or Agra. Some of them do not make any secret of being bound to sacrifice all India if that be to the glory of Islam or could save the city of their prophet. Look at the Jews: neither centuries of prosperity nor sense of gratitude for the shelter they found, nor grudges their ancestors attached or even equally attached to the several countries they inhabit. Their love is, and must necessarily be, divided between the land of their birth and the land of their Promise. If the Zionists' dreams are ever realized—! Palestine

becomes a Jewish State and it will glorify us almost as much as our Jewish friends—(they, like the Mohammedans, would naturally set the interests of their Holy land above those of their Mother-lands in America and Europe) and as a part of war between their adopted country and the Jewish State, would naturally sympathize with the latter, if indeed they do not bodily go over to it. History is too full of examples of such deviations to cite particulars. The crusades again, attest to the wonderful influence that a common religious fervor can exert upon peoples widely separated in race, nationality and language, to bind and hold them together.

The ideal conditions, therefore, under which a nation can attain perfect solidarity and cohesion would, other things being equal, be found in the case of those people who inherit the land they adore, the land of whose forefathers is also the land of their Gods and Angels, of Seers and Prophets; the accents of whose history are also the accents of their mythology.

The Hindus are about the only people who are blessed with these ideal conditions that are at the same time conducive to national solidarity, cohesion and greatness. Not even the Chinese are blessed thus. Only Arabia and Palestine—if ever the Jews can

endowed in founding their own there—can be said to possess this unique advantage. In Arabia is incomparably greater in the natural, cultural, historical, and numerical materials of a great people; and even if the dreams of the Zionists are ever realized than a Palestine State will they too must be equally lacking in these.

England, France, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Spain, Persia, Japan, Argentina. Hence of today (for the old descendants of 'Purss' and their Zepirs had died long since)—and other African States, Mexico, Peru, Chile (only too anxious to annex states and nations), and the United States, have all moved to the Westward. They are yet less advantageously situated than the more or less homogeneous nations of the East, and are less united by geographical, cultural, historical and numerical associations, besides being the unique gift of a sanctified Motherland. Of the remaining states, Russia in Europe, and United States in America, though comparatively recently settled—paired with us, are yet poorer, more pronouncedly 'alien' in their origin, and less united by the ties of the common ancestry of nations in slavery; so richly paired with us groups of racial, cultural and numerical elements as the Hindus are. Only in the possession of a common, a sacred and a parting language, the Semitic, and a sanctified Motherland, are we so far as the United States contribute to national solidarity are obstructed more for the

[illegible]

not yourselves, or full out and destroy the Kingdom of the spiritual and the organic—something that already exists—something that is based not by any scraps of paper nor by the ties of caste—alone, but by the ties of blood and birth and culture. Something that if you can pull down the barriers that have survived this millay, of caste and customs, of race and sections and sects, and if you can pull down the barriers of the provincial, national and caste, be something that they do not exist. But where they already exist as between the Sikhs and the Muslims, the Jains and the Christians, the Lingayats and the Non-Lingayats—possibly be the hand that will tear the curtain apart. Let the curtain be torn, and let the light of the spiritual be seen, and which I say stands, something even in that binds you to the world—organism, whether of blood or language or common beliefs and these or culture and love you bear to the common Motherland. Let the sacred and noble strain of Hindu Blood flow from veins to veins, from nerve to nerve, till all the Hindu people get fused into one, and the Hindu people, all the Hindu race, come into one and become one and live as one.

[illegible]

also among a regiment consisting of them went bodily over to the Muslims, who politically and racially and religiously were more closely bound up with them. Take the case of America; when the Georgia war broke out the country had to face the danger of secessions of her German citizens; while the Negro citizens there sympathized more with their brethren in Africa than with their white countrymen. American Siam, is the last reason, must stand as full with the fortunes of its Anglo-Saxon constituents. So with the Hindus, they being the people, whose past, present and future are most closely bound with the soil of Hindustan as they, as they, they constitute the foundation, the bedrock, the reserved force of the Indian state. Therefore even from the point of Indian Nationality, race, etc., Oh Hindu, consolidate and strengthen Hindu Nationality; but to give greater offence to any of our now Hindu compatriots, in fact to any one in the world but to put our own self defence of our race and land; so neither is responsible for others to betray her or to subject her to unprovoked attacks by any of those 'Fanatics' that are struggling forth from confusion to confusion. As long as other communities in India or in the world are not respectively planning India first or Muslim first, but all are busy in organizing offensive and defensive alliances and combinations on entirely narrow racial or religious or national basis, so long, at least so long, Oh Hindu, strengthen if you can those subtle bonds that like overthreads bind you as One Organism Social Being. Those of you who in a cynical fit try to cut off the most vital of these ties and dare to discover that some Hindu will find to their cost that in doing so they have cut themselves off from the very source of our racial life and strength.

The presence of only a few of these elements of nationality which we have found to constitute the united Hindu nation like Spain or Portugal to get themselves isolated in the world. But when all of these ideal conditions obtain here what is there in the human world that the Hindus cannot accomplish?

Thirty crores of people, with India for their basis of operation, for their Palestine and for their Holyland, with such a history behind them, bound together by ties of a common blood and common culture can dictate their terms to the whole world. A day will come when mankind will have to face the facts.

Equally certain it is that whenever the Hindus come to hold such a position, whence they could dictate terms to the whole world—these terms cannot be very different from the terms which Gita dictates or the Buddha lays down. A Hindu is most intensely so, when he comes to be Hindu; and with a Gita claims the whole world for a Bharata 'वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्' or with a 'Talakam' 'वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्'.

'वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्' 'वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्'.

any country? Oh remember, 'the limits of the Universe—the limits of my country lie?'